

Behavioural Indicators

Criteria	Behavioural Indicators	Rating Scale			
		1 Not met	2 Partially met	3 Fully met	4 Exceeds
<u>Academic Degree Attainment.</u> * Application form	N/A	2.2	2.1 without other evidence of academic excellence	1 st or, 2.1 with additional evidence of academic excellence	1 st plus BCL or other respected post-grad MA legal training.
<u>Written Advocacy / communication.</u> * <i>Applicants cannot be awarded 3 or 4 points if their form contains material errors in spelling, punctuation, and/or grammar (unless they've disclosed a relevant disability/ neurological difference).</i> <i>Application form and written tasks at interview</i>	(i) Answers the question asked (ii) Demonstrates high level of preparation (iii) Ability to distil volume/complexity into key points (iv) Ability to identify most persuasive points (v) Ability to filter/distil (vi) Ability to reason logically/draw analogy (vii) Ability to present work in a way which is clear, simple, digestible and impactful (viii) Spelling/grammar is excellent/perfect.	No use of persuasion or reasoning, lack of logical and digestible structure. Bad command of spelling and grammar.	Key points made in a logical, digestible format. OK command of spelling and grammar.	Key points are persuasive, impactful and make a reasoned argument. Presented in a distilled, digestible format. Very good command of spelling and grammar.	Refined key points expressed with a high degree of persuasion and impact. Presentation is structured and unified. Thread of logical and persuasive argument flows throughout. Flawless command of spelling and grammar.
<u>Analytical skills.</u> * Written tasks at interview	(i) Ability to identify key info from large volume (ii) Ability to see the unsaid / spot patterns (iii) Attention to detail	No evidence.	Key points identified and communicated.	Key points identified and evaluated accurately. Communicated effectively.	Key points of complex/technical information identified and scrutinised with precision, identifying patterns/ conclusions.

Behavioural Indicators

	(iv) Lateral thinking				Communicated with ingenuity/impact.
<u>Commitment and Motivation.</u> * Application form	to (a) the Bar and (b) commercial law <i>Experience should not be conflated with commitment when the former might be easier to come by for some.</i>	No evidence of commitment to either.	Some evidence of commitment. Candidate has undertaken mini pupillage(s) or other work experience / marshalling etc in the field of commercial law. Chose commercial law option at undergrad.	Demonstrable evidence of commitment to practice area e.g. commercial mini-pupillages, essays on commercial law, evidence that the candidate's interests or experience has a commercial law focus.	High level of commitment demonstrated e.g., expression of interest in specific commercial areas, research demonstrated in response to specific questions, evidence of choosing to focus on commercial law where options available, other examples of interest such as articles, blogging on commercial law etc.
<u>Interpersonal skills.</u> Application form and in interview	(i) Ability to manage difficult people (ii) Ability to relate to a range of different people (iii) Shows genuine respect for others (iv) Empathy (v) Emotional intelligence	No evidence.	Information about circumstances the candidate has experienced where interpersonal skills would be essential.	Evidence of engagement with a situation requiring strong interpersonal skills and effective application of these skills.	Evidence of situation(s) in which the candidate's interpersonal skills were engaged, applied effectively and changed the outcome in a difficult situation.
<u>Resilience / Working Under Pressure/Courage and Perseverance.</u> Application form and in interview.	(i) Coping with day to day successes and failures (ii) Coping with workload (iii) Bounce back from difficult judges / clients / oppo	No evidence.	Information about experience in which resilience / the ability to work under pressure	Evidence of contending with a difficult situation and appropriate application of these skills to overcome it.	Evidence of dealing with a difficult set back with determination and grit, using these skills effectively and successfully to overcome it, particularly in

Behavioural Indicators

	<p>(iv) Ability to learn from experience</p> <p>(v) Evidence of ability to produce high quality work in short period of time</p> <p>(vi) Ability to appear calm when pressured</p>		would be essential.		a high-pressure situation, e.g., when 'on the spot'.
<p><u>Overcoming Adversity</u></p> <p>Application form only</p>	<p>(i) Has experienced adversity (illness / infirmity / poverty / violence / marginalisation / bereavement / dependents)</p> <p>(ii) Has overcome it (escaped / defeated / transcended / learned from / exploited)</p> <p><i>N.B. If two candidates are level-pegging on points, one candidate will trump the other if they have overcome a material adversity. However, this row does not form part of the initial marking criteria.</i></p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p><u>Oral Advocacy. *</u></p> <p><u>Application form and in interview.</u></p>	<p>(i) Ability to speak cogently, with fluidity and in grammatically correct English.</p>	Unable to speak with any degree of cogency.	Some evidence of an ability to speak cogently.	Fluent public speaker. Good mastery of grammar.	Unusually proficient speaker showing well-paced, fluid delivery, the confidence to pause and reflect.

Behavioural Indicators

	(ii)	Ability to respond to questions cogently, without being flustered or perturbed and in grammatically correct English.	Weak understanding of grammar. Argumentative without being persuasive.	Generally good mastery of grammar but potentially with some minor slip ups. Some ability to listen.	Demonstrates many of the behavioural indicators Presents arguments in a logical reasoned way focussing on most salient points.	Demonstrates most if not all of the behavioural indicators Flawless mastery of grammar.
	(iii)	Ability to show logical reasoning and focus on key points even where put on the spot	Poor listening or following of instructions. No evidence of mooting, public speaking etc.	Some ability to accept weaker points and push stronger ones, but generally lacking in persuasive power. Potentially has evidence of mooting, debating experience or advocacy experience in another setting e.g. public speaking, presentations, sales, lecturing.	Has the ability to listen to questions and answer them directly and with clarity. Generally good at discriminating between strong and weak points and generally persuasive. Might also have success in mooting competition, advocacy competition, real tribunal / court setting.	Is able to listen to question and respond to that question directly in a way that is both accurate and also persuasive. Has a total mastery of the material, accepts weaker points and pushes stronger ones in a fashion that is highly persuasive. May include, success(es) in significant/competitive mooting competition(s), advocacy competition(s), or difficult court / tribunal case.
	(iv)	Ability to listen				
	(v)	Demonstrates persuasiveness including ability to identify most persuasive arguments				
	(vi)	Ability to adapt and respond when put on the spot				
	(vii)	Ability/confidence to accept weaker points and push stronger ones			Evidence of advocacy applied effectively in a practical scenario e.g. Supporting someone effectively in a non-legal advocacy role such as in school, hospital or care home or, effective pitch in business /charity setting or	Demonstrable evidence of advocacy changing the outcome in a real-life situation or practical scenario involving a non-legal advocacy role. Evidence of success of oral advocacy in a formal/legal

Behavioural Indicators

				effective advocacy when teaching. Evidence of oral advocacy in a formal/legal setting should not be weighted more heavily than advocacy in a different setting.	setting should not be weighted more heavily than success in a different setting.
<p><u>Ethical Integrity.</u></p> <p><i>These behavioural Indicators apply at the second round interview stage only.</i></p> <p><i>At the application form and first round interview stages, all applicants are assumed to have ethical integrity unless there is conclusive evidence otherwise. Where there is such evidence, the applicant will not be invited to the next stage.</i></p>	<p>(i) When presented with an ethical problem the candidate is able to identify it as an ethical issue.</p> <p>(ii) Having identified the ethical issue, the candidate then identifies a responsible course of action.</p> <p>(iii) If the candidate does not know the right course of action they say so, and say they would ask for assistance in identifying the correct way forward.</p>	<p>Candidate is either unable to identify that there is an ethical issue, or does so but suggests adopting an unethical response</p>	<p>Candidate has some ability to identify an ethical issue potentially with some prompting.</p> <p>They make an effort to identify the correct response, but that attempt is either partially flawed or not thought through in sufficient detail.</p>	<p>Candidate grasps the ethical issue (potentially with some prompting).</p> <p>Their suggested response is correct and thought through.</p> <p>And, if they don't know the answer, they identify how they would find it (by speaking to the BSB).</p>	<p>Candidate fully grasps the ethical issue. Shows total command of it and of how to deal with it.</p>

Notes

Behavioural Indicators

- Where a question on the application form focuses on one of the competencies in particular this is noted, but assessment of the competency is not limited to consideration of that question.
- There is a discretion to take into account extenuating circumstances in respect of academic attainment
- Our pupillage recruitment process must comply with our positive duty to make reasonable adjustments for disability, where known about, throughout the process. This is distinct from the discretion to take into account mitigating factors / extenuating circumstances, which may also include disability. Chambers will take active steps to reduce the obstacles that disability presents in the application process. Where reasonable adjustments are requested, required or implemented this plays no part in marking applications or deciding whether to offer a candidate an interview or a pupillage. The Head of Pupillage should be made aware of any applicants for pupillage disclosing disability so that we can comply with our obligations. The Head of Pupillage is not involved in marking application forms or interviewing
- A * means Stone places considerable weight on this point.